



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**EFFECTS OF RECOMBINANT *LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS* AND
BACTERIOCIN UL4 IN THE PROTECTION OF TILAPIA
(*OREOCHROMIS NILOTICUS*) AGAINST *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

ANURADHA KARUNAKARAMOORTHY

FBSB 2009 6

**EFFECTS OF RECOMBINANT *LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS* AND
BACTERIOCIN UL4 IN THE PROTECTION OF TILAPIA (*OREOCHROMIS
NILOTICUS*) AGAINST *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

By

ANURADHA KARUNAKARAMOORTHY

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,

In Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

April 2009



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**EFFECTS OF RECOMBINANT *LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS* AND
BACTERIOCIN UL4 IN THE PROTECTION OF TILAPIA (*OREOCHROMIS
NILOTICUS*) AGAINST *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

By

ANURADHA KARUNAKARAMOORTHY

April 2009

Chairman: Foo Hooi Ling, PhD

Faculty: Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences

The study was conducted to determine the effects of constructed recombinant *Lactococcus lactis* and bacteriocin UL4 for the protection of tilapia against *Aeromonas hydrophila*. For the constructions of recombinant *L. lactis*, a 250 bp domain 1 and 750 bp domain 4 of aerolysin produced by *A. hydrophila* were amplified by PCR and individually cloned into pNZ8048. The constructed plasmids, designated as pNHD1 and pNHD4, were then electrotransformed into *Lactococcus lactis*. Total RNA was then extracted and subjected to reverse transcriptase PCR. The agarose gel electrophoresis results showed the expected bands of pNHD1 and pNHD4 with 268 bp and 768 bp respectively. Subsequently, whole cell protein of recombinant *L. lactis* was extracted and separated by SDS-PAGE prior to Western blot analysis. The results of immunoblots using specific polyclonal antibodies showed that both domains 1 (~9 kDa) and 4 (~30 kDa) were successfully expressed in *L. lactis*.

On the first fish trial, tilapia was injected intraperitoneally using recombinant *L. lactis*. Growth performance of tilapia with recombinant *L. lactis* was more profound and ELISA results showed a significantly higher antibody level ($P < 0.05$) compared to control groups. The survival rate after challenge was more than 80 % for recombinant *L. lactis* groups, whereas only 60 % was observed for control group. Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) count of intestine digesta of fish that survived was maintained at high count ($> 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) compared to control. On the other hand, the Enterobacteriaceae and *A. hydrophila* count were maintained at low count ($< 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) after the trial. For the second trial, tilapia was orally immunized using recombinant *L. lactis* for four weeks. The growth performance of fish with recombinant *L. lactis* was more profound than control fish, even after challenged with *A. hydrophila*. Moreover, the antibody level increased significantly in week 2 in fish serum fed with recombinant *L. lactis* compared to control. The survival rate of tilapia after challenge was 100 % for recombinant *L. lactis*. The Enterobacteriaceae and *A. hydrophila* count of intestine digesta of survived fish was maintained at low count ($< 5 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) compared to control, whereas the LAB count were maintained at more than $4 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$.

The best bacteriocin producer from six strains of *L. plantarum* isolated from local foods was identified and bacteriocin UL4 was selected based on antimicrobial activity determined by the diameter of the inhibition zone of *A. hydrophila*. Oral feeding was carried out and better growth performance was observed in bacteriocin UL4 fed tilapia compared to control. ELISA results showed the antibody level increased significantly in week 3 in fish serum fed with bacteriocin compared to

control. The survival rate after challenge was 100 % and only 45 % for bacteriocin fed fish and control fish respectively. Enterobacteriaceae and *A. hydrophila* count of intestine digesta of survived fish maintained at low count ($< 5 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) compared to control, whereas LAB count were maintained at high count ($> 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$).

The results obtained in this study indicate the vast potential of recombinant *L. lactis* as a promising vaccine to prevent the infection of *A. hydrophila* particularly and generally to reduce the extensive use of antibiotics in controlling diseases and for the overall improvement of the health of fishes. The bacteriocin from LAB also showed good effects on the health improvement of fish and could be an ideal alternative to be used as a supplement for a general protection and prevention of diseases.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**KESAN REKOMBINAN *LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS* DAN BAKTERIOSIN UL4
UNTUK PERLINDUNGAN BAGI IKAN TILAPIA, *OREOCHROMIS
NILOTICUS* TERHADAP *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

Oleh

ANURADHA KARUNAKARAMOORTHY

April 2009

Pengerusi: Foo Hooi Ling, PhD

Fakulti: Fakulti Bioteknologi dan Sains Biomolekul

Kajian ini dijalankan untuk menentukan kesan rekombinan *Lactococcus lactis* dan bakteriosin UL4 untuk perlindungan ikan tilapia terhadap *Aeromonas hydrophila*. Dalam kajian ini, 250 bp domain 1 dan 750 bp domain 4 aerolysin telah diamplifikasi dengan PCR dan diklon dalam pNZ8048 secara berasingan. Plasmid yang telah dihasilkan, iaitu pNHD1 dan pNHD4 dielektrotransformasikan ke dalam *Lactococcus lactis*. Selepas itu, RNA diekstrak dan digunakan untuk transkrip terbalik PCR dan keputusan gel agaros menunjukkan jalur pada saiz yang dijangka bagi pNHD1 dan pNHD4 dengan 268 bp dan 768 bp masing-masing. Sejurus itu, protein sel rekombinan *L. lactis* diekstrak dan dipisahkan menggunakan SDS-PAGE sebelum kajian Western Blot dilakukan. Western Blot dengan menggunakan spesifik antibodi poliklonal menunjukkan kedua-dua domain 1 (~ 9 kDa) dan 4 (~30 kDa) telah berjaya diekspres dalam *L. lactis*.

Bagi eksperimen yang pertama, ikan tilapia telah disuntik secara intraperitoneal dengan menggunakan rekombinan bakteria *L. lactis*. Kadar pertumbuhan tilapia dengan menggunakan rekombinan *L. lactis* lebih tinggi dan keputusan ELISA menunjukkan tahap antibodi meningkat dengan signifikan ($P < 0.05$) bagi rekombinan *L. lactis*. Kadar hidup tilapia selepas dicabar, adalah melebihi 80 % bagi kumpulan rekombinan *L. lactis*, manakala hanya 60 % untuk rawatan kawalan. Kiraan LAB dalam digesta ikan dikekalkan pada tahap tinggi ($> 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) berbanding rawatan kawalan dan kiraan Enterobacteriaceae dan *A. hydrophila* dikekalkan pada tahap rendah ($< 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$). Bagi eksperimen kedua, ikan tilapia diberi vaksin secara oral untuk 4 minggu. Kadar pertumbuhan tilapia dengan menggunakan rekombinan *L. lactis* lebih tinggi daripada rawatan kawalan, walaupun selepas dicabar dengan *A. hydrophila*. Keputusan ELISA menunjukkan tahap antibodi meningkat dengan signifikan ($P < 0.05$) bagi rekombinan *L. lactis* pada minggu kedua berbanding dengan rawatan kawalan. Kadar hidup selepas dicabar dengan *A. hydrophila* adalah 100 % bagi rekombinan *L. lactis*. Kiraan Enterobacteriaceae dan *A. hydrophila* dalam usus ikan dikekalkan pada tahap rendah ($< 5 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) berbanding kontrol. Manakala, kiraan LAB dikekalkan pada tahap tinggi ($> 4 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$).

Bakteriosin yang terbaik daripada enam strain *Lactobacillus plantarum* di kenalpasti dan bakteriosin UL4, dipilih berdasarkan aktiviti bakteriosin dan diameter zon perencatan dengan *A. hydrophila*. Pemakanan oral diberikan dengan menggunakan bakteriosin dan kadar pertumbuhan tilapia dengan menggunakan bakteriosin lebih tinggi daripada kawalan, walaupun selepas dicabar dengan *A. hydrophila*. Keputusan ELISA menunjukkan tahap antibodi meningkat dengan signifikan ($P < 0.05$) bagi bakteriosin pada minggu ketiga berbanding dengan rawatan kawalan. Kadar hidup

tilapia selepas dicabar dengan *A. hydrophila* adalah 100 % bagi bakteriosin manakala hanya 45 % bagi kawalan. Kiraan Enterobacteriaceae dan *A. hydrophila* dalam digesta ikan dikekalkan pada tahap rendah ($< 5 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) dan kiraan LAB dikekalkan pada tahap tinggi ($> 6 \log \text{ cfu/ml}$) berbanding kawalan.

Keputusan yang diperolehi menunjukkan potensi rekombinan *L. lactis* sebagai vaksin bagi mencegah jangkitan daripada *A. hydrophila* khususnya dan juga mengurangkan penggunaan antibiotik bagi mengawal penyakit. Manakala, bakteriosin dari LAB menunjukkan kesan yang baik bagi memperbaiki kesihatan ikan dan boleh menjadi alternatif sebagai makanan tambahan untuk mencegah jangkitan secara umum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Foo Hooi Ling for her invaluable guidance, patience and continuous encouragement throughout my study. I'm also immensely grateful for the advice and support given by my supervisory committee members, Prof. Dr. Raha Abdul Rahim and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mariana Nor Shamsudin. I would like also to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Loh Teck Chwen for his helpful comments and guidance.

I would like to convey warm thanks to my labmates especially Yin Sze, Tze Young, Sabrina, Kak Yan, Yaya, Deela, Shahrul, Boon Hooi and Hossein for their help. I would also wish to express my gratitude to Mr. Perumal from MARSLAB for his advice and technical assistance.

Last but not least, thanks to my family and my fiancé, Mr. Nageswaran for their love and care.

DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which has been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

ANURADHA KARUNAKARAMOORTHY

Date:

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Differentiation between the motile <i>Aeromonas</i> species by biochemical properties	7
2.2 Comparison of the immune system of fish and mammals	24
2.3 Classes of bacteriocins produced by LAB	34
3.1 Bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study	54
4.1 Bacteria and plasmids used in this study	76
4.2 Immunization schedule	78
4.3 Growth performance of fishes injected intraperitoneally with different dosage of recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> D1 and D4.	83
4.4 Antibody production in tilapia vaccinated intraperitoneally with different immunogenic epitopes of <i>A. hydrophila</i> expressed in <i>L. lactis</i>	85
5.1 Recovery of viable count of recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> D1 and D4 incorporated into the feed and after immersion in water	96
5.2 Growth performance of fishes fed with different dosage of recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> D1 and D4	100
5.3 Antibody production in tilapia vaccinated orally with different immunogenic epitopes of <i>A. hydrophila</i> expressed in <i>L. lactis</i>	102
6.2 Clear inhibition zones produced by six different types of spray-dried bacteriocin of <i>L. plantarum</i> strains against pathogenic <i>A. hydrophila</i> .	112
6.3 Growth performance of fishes fed with bacteriocin UL4	116
6.4 Antibody production in tilapia fed with bacteriocin UL4	117

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Scanning electron micrograph of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> attached to a human intestinal epithelial cell line	10
2.2	Hemorrhages and ulcers caused by <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	12
2.3	Steps in channel formation on cell wall by aerolysin	16
2.4	Domain structure of aerolysin	18
3.1	Rig for Semi-dry Electroblothing	64
3.2	Agarose gel electrophoresis analysis of PCR amplified of D1 and D4 domains of aerolysin	66
3.3	Restriction enzyme digestion analysis of plasmids pNHD1 and pNHD4	66
3.4	Agarose gel electrophoresis analysis of RT-PCR amplified D1 domain of aerolysin	69
3.5	Agarose gel electrophoresis analysis of RT-PCR amplified D4 domain of aerolysin	70
3.6	SDS-PAGE analysis of the denatured recombinant protein of D1	71
3.7.	SDS-PAGE analysis of the denatured recombinant protein of D4	71
3.8	Western Blot analysis of the denatured recombinant protein of D1	73
3.9	Western Blot analysis of the denatured recombinant protein of D4	73
4.1	Set-up of experimental tanks	77
4.2	Effect of recombinant intraperitoneally injected recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> on body weight of tilapia for the duration of five weeks and after challenge with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	82

4.3	Effect of intraperitoneally injected recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> on survival rate of tilapia after challenge with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	87
4.4	Bacteria viable count in fish digesta injected with recombinant <i>L. lactis</i>	88
5.1	Set-up of experimental tanks	93
5.2	Effect of orally fed recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> on body weight of tilapia for the duration of four weeks and after challenge with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	99
5.3	Effect of orally fed recombinant <i>L. lactis</i> on survival rate of tilapia after challenge with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	104
5.4	Bacteria viable count in fish digesta fed with recombinant <i>L. lactis</i>	105
6.1	Clear inhibition zones produced by six different types of spray-dried bacteriocin of <i>L. plantarum</i> strains against pathogenic <i>A. hydrophila</i> .	113
6.2	Effect of bacteriocin UL4 on body weight of tilapia for the duration of four weeks and after being challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	115
6.3	Effect of bacteriocin UL4 on survival rate of tilapia after being challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	118
6.4	Bacteria viable count in fish digesta fed with bacteriocin UL4	119

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

%	percentage
Ω	ohm
A	absorbance
AU	arbitrary unit
bp	base pair
BSA	bovine serum albumin
CFU	colony forming unit
D1	domain 1
D4	domain 4
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
DO	dissolved oxygen
EDTA	ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid
ELISA	Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay
EMB	Eosin Methylene Blue Agar
EtBr	ethidium bromide
FCR	feed conversion ratio
GSP	Glutamate Starch Phenol Red Agar
h	hour
kDa	kiloDalton
LAB	lactic acid bacteria
LB	Luria Bertani
M	molarity

min	minute
mM	milimolar
MRS	de Man, Rogosa and Sharp agar
N	normality
ng	nanogram
nm	nanometer
° C	degree Celcius
PBS	phosphate buffered saline
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
RE	restriction enzyme
RNA	ribonucleic acid
SDS	sodium dodecyl sulfate
SGR	specific growth rate
T	treatment
TAE	tris-acetate EDTA
Taq	<i>Thermus aquaticus</i>
TEMED	tetramethyl-ethylene diamine
U	unit
μl	microlitre
μg	microgram
UV	ultra-violet
v	volt
v/v	volume per volume
w/v	weight per volume

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Foo Hooi Ling, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Raha Abdul Rahim, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Mariana Nor Shamsudin, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 8 June 2009



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL	ix
DECLARATION	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
 CHAPTER	
 1 INTRODUCTION	 1
 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Aeromonads	6
2.2 <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	8
2.2.1 Cell Structure and Metabolism	9
2.2.2 Ecology of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	10
2.2.3 Fish Diseases Caused by <i>Aeromonas Hydrophila</i>	12
2.2.4 Pathogenesis of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	13
2.2.5 Extracellular Protein of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> - Aerolysin	14
2.2.7 Structure of Aerolysin	17
2.2.8 Control and Treatments of <i>A. hydrophila</i>	21
2.3 Fish Immunity and Vaccination	23
2.3.1 Methods of Vaccine Delivery to Fish	24
2.3.2 Vaccine Delivery for <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	28
2.4 Lactic Acid Bacteria (LAB)	30
2.4.1 Introduction	30
2.4.2 Antimicrobial Compounds of LAB	31
2.4.3 Importance of LAB	39
2.4.4 LAB as Immunotherapeutic Agents: Genetic Aspects	41
2.4.5 <i>Lactococcus lactis</i> as a Vaccine Delivery Vehicle	43
2.4.6 Use of LAB in Aquaculture	47
2.4.7 Conclusions and Future Perspectives	51
 3 CLONING AND EXPRESSION OF IMMUNOGENIC EPITOPES OF <i>AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA</i> IN <i>LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS</i>	 53
3.1 Introduction	53
3.2 Methodology	54

3.2.1	Bacterial Strains, Plasmids and Growth Conditions	55
3.2.2	DNA Techniques and Transformation	56
3.2.3	RNA Analysis	61
3.2.4	Protein Expression	61
3.3	Results and Discussion	65
3.3.1	Construction of Recombinant Plasmids	65
3.3.2	Transcription Analysis	69
3.3.3	Protein Expression	70
3.4	Conclusion	74
4	EFFICACY DETERMINATION OF <i>LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS</i> RECOMBINANTS AS VACCINE FOR TILAPIA VIA INTRAPERITONEAL INJECTION	75
4.1	Introduction	75
4.2	Methodology	75
4.2.1	Bacterial Strains and Growth Conditions	76
4.2.2	Experimental Design	76
4.2.3	Vaccine Preparation	77
4.2.4	Immunization Schedule	77
4.2.5	Water Quality Parameters	79
4.2.6	Growth Parameters	79
4.2.7	Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)	79
4.2.8	Challenge Test	80
4.2.9	Microbial Analysis	80
4.2.10	Statistical Analysis	81
4.3	Results and Discussion	81
4.3.1	General Observation	81
4.3.2	Water Quality Parameters	81
4.3.3	Growth Parameters	82
4.3.4	Efficacies of Immunogenic Epitopes	84
4.3.5	Challenge Test	86
4.3.6	Microbial Analysis	88
4.4	Conclusion	90
5	EFFICACY DETERMINATION OF <i>LACTOCOCCUS LACTIS</i> RECOMBINANTS AS ORAL VACCINE FOR TILAPIA	91
5.1	Introduction	91
5.2	Methodology	92
5.2.1	Bacterial Strains and Growth Conditions	92
5.2.2	Experimental Design	93
5.2.3	Experimental Diets Preparation	93
5.2.4	Viability of Experimental Diets	94
5.2.5	Water Quality Parameters	94
5.2.6	Growth Parameters	94

5.2.7	Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)	94
5.2.8	Challenge Test with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	94
5.2.9	Microbial Analysis	95
5.2.10	Statistical Analysis	95
5.3	Results and Discussion	95
5.3.1	Viability of Experimental Diets	95
5.3.2	General Observation	97
5.3.3	Water Quality Parameters	97
5.3.4	Growth Parameters	97
5.3.5	Efficacies of Immunogenic Epitopes	101
5.3.6	Challenge Test with <i>A. hydrophila</i>	103
5.3.7	Microbial Analysis	105
5.4	Conclusion	106
6	EFFECT OF BACTERIOCIN UL4 AS FEED SUPPLEMENT FOR TILAPIA	107
6.1	Introduction	107
6.2	Methodology	108
6.2.1	Preparation of Spray-Dried Bacteriocin	108
6.2.2	Agar -Well Diffussion Assay	108
6.2.3	Critical Dilution Method	108
6.2.4	Fish Trials with Bacteriocin UL4 as Feed Supplement	110
6.3	Results and Discussion	112
6.3.1	Agar -Well Diffussion Assay	112
6.3.2	Critical Dilution Method	112
6.3.3	Fish Trial via Oral Feeding	114
6.4	Conclusion	120
7	GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	121
	REFERENCES	136
	APPENDICES	157
	BIODATA OF THE STUDENT	168

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are Gram positive and nonspore forming cocci or rods, which produce lactic acid as their main metabolic product. The genera *Lactobacillus*, *Lactococcus*, *Leuconostoc*, *Pediococcus* and *Streptococcus* are important members of this group. LAB are commonly found in foods, including fermented meat, vegetables, fruits, beverages and dairy products, but also in the respiratory, intestinal and genital tracts of humans and animals, in sewage and in plant materials (de Vuyst and Vandamme, 1994). The importance of LAB is increasing due to its classification as “generally regarded as safe” organism (GRAS) (Gatesoupe, 1999).

LAB and their biotechnological exploitations have received vast attention for the last two decades. One significant example is the application of protein engineering techniques in LAB, notable examples being the lactococcal proteinase (Vos *et al.*, 1990), the lactose repressor gene of *Lactococcus lactis* (van Rooijen *et al.*, 1993) and the lantibiotic nisin (Kuipers *et al.*, 1992). Bacteriocins in general have been characterized in considerable detail, for instances the additional lantibiotics such as lactocin S from *Lactobacillus sake* (Nes *et al.*, 1993) and the emergence of a group of related 'small heat stable bacteriocins' which produces by several species of LAB (Marugg *et al.*, 1992). Bacteriocins can be used as a ‘target drugs’ towards specific pathogens without disturbing the beneficial microbiota. Hence, they could then limit the use of antibiotics to some extent and thus delay the evolution of antibiotic resistance. Bacteriocins are naturally produced, so they are more easily accepted by

consumers. Interest in bacteriocins is to some extent fuelled by their potential as novel biopreservatives and several have been shown vast potential in this regard.

LAB that use as live organisms in food fermentations may be the suitable microorganisms for live vaccine delivery vectors. For example, *L. lactis* is a food-grade, non-pathogenic, non-invasive and non-colonizing bacterium that has the potential to deliver vaccine antigen effectively (van Rooijen *et al.*, 1993). Recently, recombinant strains of *L. lactis* have been developed to deliver cytokines and specific antigens across mucosal surfaces to the immune system of animals (Nga, 2005). Protein secretion by this GRAS bacterium would allow production directly in a food product and interaction between the secreted protein (enzyme or antigen) and the environment (the food product itself or the digestive tract). High level production of heterologous proteins in *L. lactis* has been obtained using lactococcal constitutive or inducible promoters (Kuipers *et al.*, 1997; de Vos, 1999).

To develop efficient vaccines, two components are essential: the bacterial vector strain and a well-adapted antigen presentation system. Ideal mucosal vaccines should promote an effective contact between the antigen and the immune system, stimulate humoral and cellular immune responses, produce long term protection after a single dose, stable and non-toxic (Jennings *et al.*, 1998). To circumvent some of the safety and environmental issues inherent to the wide-scale dissemination of engineered pathogens, non-pathogenic Gram-positive LAB vectors have been developed (Ribeiro *et al.*, 2002). In addition to their GRAS status, some LAB are able to stimulate the immune system of the hosts as adjuvants due to their probiotic properties and their immunomodulation capacity (Shu and Gill, 2002). The

combinations of these properties makes LAB to be very advantageous live vaccines and many studies are under way to express antigens in LAB and to evaluate the effect of this antigen presentation system on the immune system.

The research of LAB for aquatic animals is increasing with the demand for evolution of aquaculture approach to “environment-friendly” or “Green agriculture”. Aquaculture plays an important role in global food supply, food security and the development of national economies. In Malaysia, fish production is expected to increase from 1.48 million metric tonnes in 2000 to 1.93 million metric tonnes by 2010 (Liaw and Fung, 2000). The fact that national marine capture fisheries already have an upper limit of production. It means that the demand must be met by the aquaculture industry. The main drawbacks identified in aquaculture industry are the nutrition and disease problems, which are the main problems of the unsatisfactorily production of aquaculture.

Specific bacterial pathogens can be an important cause of mortalities in fish hatcheries, as intensive husbandry practice often result in breakdown of the natural host barriers. One of the difficulties of intensive fish culture is the control of diseases caused by pathogens such as *Aeromonas hydrophila*, one of the most common bacteria in freshwater. Possible consequences of *A. hydrophila* infection to fish are skin lesions, which can result in haemorrhagic septicaemia and followed by high mortalities (Rahman and Kawai, 1999). However, the indiscriminate use of antibiotics in disease control in many sections of the aquaculture industry has led to selective pressure of antibiotic resistance in bacteria, a property that may be readily transferred to other bacteria (Sorum, 1999). It also poses a significant risk to

consumer's health through the potential transfer of resistance to human pathogens, antibiotic residues or chemical contaminants in marketed aquaculture products. Further, widespread use of antibiotics also places the production environment at risk (Sahoo and Mukherjee, 1999). Hence, the use of live microbial feed supplement which benefit the host by modifying the host-associated or ambient microbial community, by enhancing the host response towards disease, by ensuring improved use of feed or enhancing its nutritional value or by improving the quality of its ambient environment (Vershuere *et al.*, 2000) in aquaculture is being encouraged.

The exact mode of action of the probiotic bacteria has not been fully elucidated, nevertheless it is thought to be mediated through the production of inhibitory compounds, competition for chemicals or available energy or for adhesion sites besides enhancing immune responses. Very little is known about the relative importance of these mechanisms. In addition, only Villamil *et al.*, (2002) and Rengpipat *et al.*, (2000) reported the immune responses in aquatic animals after probiotic supplementation. On the other hand, during the last decade the application of probiotics taking advantage of its pathogen control potential has been increasing in aquaculture. According to Gudding *et al.*, (1999), stimulation of the specific and non-specific immunity is the basis for developing aquaculture into sustainable bioproduction in aquatic ecosystems.

A need to overcome this problem has arisen and possible solutions can be found by using LAB as feed supplement or as vaccine delivery vehicle. Although the promising prospects of LAB have been extensively reported, but considerable research on recombinant LAB carrying specific antigen epitopes of pathogen as live

vaccines and the potential of LAB metabolites on aquaculture have not been conducted. Therefore, this study was conducted to investigate the use of recombinant *Lactococcus lactis* and bacteriocin UL4 for the protection of tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*, against *Aeromonas hydrophila* and the specific objectives of this study were:

- i) To construct recombinant *L. lactis* harboring aerolysin domains 1 and 4 of *A. hydrophila*.
- ii) To determine the efficacy of *L. lactis* recombinants harbouring the constructs of aerolysin domains 1 and 4 of *A. hydrophila* as vaccine for tilapia via intraperitoneal injection.
- iii) To determine the efficacy of *L. lactis* recombinants harbouring the constructs of aerolysin domains 1 and 4 of *A. hydrophila* as oral vaccine for tilapia.
- iv) To determine the effect of bacteriocin UL4 as feed supplement for tilapia.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Aeromonads

Aeromonads are ubiquitous, oxidase-positive, facultatively anaerobic, glucose-fermenting, Gram-negative bacteria that are native to aquatic environments (Hazen *et al.*, 1978). They have been found in brackish, fresh, estuarine, marine, chlorinated and unchlorinated water supplies worldwide, with the highest numbers obtained in the warmer months (Van der Kooj *et al.*, 1988; Kaper *et al.*, 1981 and Hazen *et al.*, 1978). Aeromonads have been isolated from diseased cold and warm blooded animals for over 100 years and from humans since the early 1950s (Mathewson and Dupont, 1992).

The motile aeromonads, as the group appellation suggests, are characterized by active motility, achieved by means of a single polar flagellum, and production of gas, as well as acid from carbohydrates. They are bacilli or cocci-bacilli measuring $0.5\ \mu\text{m} \times 1.0 - 1.5\ \mu\text{m}$. The optimum growth temperature for motile aeromonads is 28 °C but depending upon the species, it varies with a very wide temperature growth range (< 4 °C to 45 °C) and optimal pH value around 6.5 - 7.5 with a range of 5.2 to 9.8 pH tolerability (Anjana *et al.*, 2005).

The genus *Aeromonas* has undergone a number of taxonomic and nomenclature revisions (Chacon *et al.*, 2002). Although originally placed in the family which also